	Case 1:16 or 10222 EDS Decument 66 Filed 05/19/19 Dage 1 of 25	
	Case 1:16-cr-10323-FDS Document 66 Filed 05/18/18 Page 1 of 25	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	
3		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )	
5	vs. ) Criminal Action	
6	JOSEPH L. ANGELO, JR., ) No. 16-10323-FDS  Defendant )	
7	)	
8	)	
9		
10	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE F. DENNIS SAYLOR, IV	
11	SENTENCING	
12		
13		
14	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse	
15	Courtroom No. 2 One Courthouse Way	
16	Boston, MA 02210	
17	April 30, 2018	
18	2:02 p.m.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	Valerie A. O'Hara Official Court Reporter	
24	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Room 3204	
25	Boston, MA 02210 E-mail: vaohara@gmail.com	

Case 1:16-cr-10323-FDS Document 66 Filed 05/18/18 Page 2 of 25 APPEARANCES: For The United States: United States Attorney's Office, by VICTOR A. WILD, ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200, Boston, Massachusetts 02110; For the Defendant: Chambers Law Office, by RICHARD CULLIN CHAMBERS, JR., ESQ., 220 Broadway, Lynnfield, Massachusetts 01940. ALSO PRESENT: Kelly Bell 

## PROCEEDINGS THE CLERK: All rise. Thank you. Please be seated. 2. Court is now in session in the matter of United States vs. 3 Joseph Angelo, Criminal Action Number 16-10323. 4 5 Would counsel please identify themselves for the 6 record. MR. WILD: Good afternoon, your Honor, Victor A. Wild, 7 and may I have Kelly Bell at counsel table? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes, good afternoon. 02:02PM 10 MR. CHAMBERS: Good afternoon, your Honor, may it 11 please the Court, Richard Chambers, Jr. for Mr. Angelo, who is 12 seated to my right. 1.3 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. This is the 14 sentencing of Joseph Angelo. I've received the pre-sentence 15 report as revised through April 4th, the defendant's sentencing 16 memorandum, which included a statement from the defendant, from 17 his wife, and from other friends and family members and supporters, the government's sentencing memorandum, and I think 18 19 I have one victim impact statement involving the Colorado land deal. 02:03PM 20 Is that it, Mr. Wild? 21 MR. WILD: That's correct, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: To my knowledge, that's all of it. 23 there anything else that I should have seen that I have not, Mr. Wild? 24 25 MR. WILD: Not that I'm aware of.

1 THE COURT: Mr. Chambers. 2. MR. CHAMBERS: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Chambers, have you had an opportunity 3 to review the pre-sentence report? 4 MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And have you gone over it with the defendant? 7 MR. CHAMBERS: I have. 8 9 THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Angelo? 02:03PM 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes. 11 THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Wild, are there any 12 victims who wish to participate in the proceeding? 1.3 MR. WILD: No, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Let me turn to the objections. 1.5 government had an objection as to the loss amount for I don't 16 remember if the victim's name is Curry, but, anyway, but Curry is either a person or entity or both. There's a question how 17 much of the fees or loss is properly attributable to the 18 19 defendant for these purposes. Based on my review, I think probation has it right. 02:04PM 20 21 There's kind of an proximate cause question here. Arguably, 22 the whole thing is attributable to the defendant, but I think 23 that goes too far, and I think the appropriate amount is the 24 \$30,000 loan fee and \$100,000 in loan extension payments, which

would be \$130,000, and I would not include the attorney's fees.

This is probably all somewhat academic because I don't think restitution is likely to be paid in any significant amount, but unless anyone needs clarification, that's how I propose to handle that objection.

MR. WILD: No, your Honor, indeed, in my sentencing memorandum, we did not press the attorney's fees.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then the government had a further objection concerning the issue of theft of identification information, which probation agreed to. The defense objects generally to paragraph 38, which I think outlines the victims.

Mr. Chambers, did you have a specific objection you wanted to press on that?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, your Honor. That's a two-level enhancement, and we're objecting to that. My client has accepted full responsibility for his actions, and when he came before the Court to take a plea, if your Honor recalls, he specifically said he never signed her signature or did anything as far as the victim identity fraud, and I would point out to the Court that in that case, that was Corona Dry Wall, I believe, but that victim actually received the benefit of being financed, and had, in fact, she had an objection, or in fact, she had accused my client of forging her signature, she took the money.

And in that case, your Honor, again, there's no

02:05РМ 10

2.

1.5

02:05PM 20

evidence before the Court that my client forged her signature or assumed her identity, and I think identity theft is a different type of crime here, and so that's why we're objecting to those enhancements.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond to that, Mr. Wild?

MR. WILD: Only to refer the Court back to the

government's sentencing memorandum at pages 5, 6 and 7 and to

very briefly state that both on the legal predicate and on the

facts of this case, the enhancement clearly applies.

The defendant was the one responsible for using that forged signature. He did gain financially from it. The person who received it from him is the one who actually went and obtained the loan because he asked her to.

So on both a factual -- and she received the forged document from him, so on both the factual and the legal basis, I suggest it fully applies and the fact that he compelled this victim to accept a much smaller loan than she needed under terrible terms of daily interest she couldn't afford does not absolve him of the fact that he had first committed the identity theft.

THE COURT: All right. Based on paragraphs 27 and 28 of the PSR and the analysis the government has adopted by probation at pages 34 and 35, I'm overruling that objection, so I think that takes care of everything.

Let me turn to the guideline calculations. The base

02:06PM 10

2.

1.3

\_\_\_\_

02:07PM 20

offense level is 7. There's a 14-level enhancement based on the loss amount being between \$550,000 and \$1.5 million, there's a four-level enhancement based on the number of victims with substantial hardships, the two-level we just talked about for identification theft. All of that totals up to level 27.

There is a downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility with third level on government motion.

Mr. Wild, does the government so move?

MR. WILD: I so move, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That's allowed, and that takes three levels off for a level 24, his criminal history score is 0, his criminal history category is I, and that produces a Sentencing Guideline range of 51 to 63 months in prison, a supervised release range of 1 to 3 years, a fine range of \$10,000 to somewhere north of \$25 million, restitution in the amount of \$1,164,568.69 and a special assessment of \$100 on each count for a total of \$1,100.

Is there any further objection or correction?

MR. WILD: No correction from the government. If I may make a comment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WILD: You previously entered an order granting the government's forfeiture motion for a \$95,000 lesser amount. That amount has been adjusted upward correctly by the probation department based on further analysis and information, but we do

02:08PM 10

2.

02:09PM 20

not request a modification of the forfeiture order.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Chambers.

1

2.

3

4

6

7

9

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:10PM 20

02:10PM 10

MR. CHAMBERS: Judge, the defense would be objecting to the four-level enhancement based on the number of victims and based on the fact that it appears that the government has only one letter from a victim. There's no other evidence before the Court as far as the financial hardship that these victims have experienced.

THE COURT: All right. That's overruled. It's all laid out in the pre-sentence report, so I'm going to leave that where it is, and so with that as the calculation of the guidelines, let me hear first from the government as to its recommendation and then Mr. Chambers. Mr. Wild.

MR. WILD: The calculations the government submits are correct, and the Court has adopted those. The Court has the government's sentencing memorandum where we asked the Court to impose 54 months of imprisonment. That's a mid-guideline range, three years of supervised release, special assessments aggregating \$1100 and restitution to be ordered in the \$1,164,568.69, and if I may orally amend my last paragraph, your Honor, to match that figure rather than the forfeiture figure that had previously been used in the draft pre-sentence report and in the government's statement of facts to probation before probation completed its analysis.

Those are the terms of imprisonment and punishment

2.

1.3

1.5

02:12PM 20

02:11PM 10

that the government recommends. We do so for the reasons set forth in the government's sentencing memorandum, and I know the Court thoroughly reads materials before it takes the bench.

I want to simply reiterate that the offenses of this defendant went on for a period of four years. It's not an one-off, it's not a two-off, it's not a three-off, as our evidence developed. There were 10 victims in the indictment. We have uncovered at least three more that predated the indictment that involved the same kind of conduct. Indeed, one of those, a Canadian company. The defendant used some of funds from the victims in the indictment to pay \$50,000 to a previous victim.

The defendant claims that he had a gambling addiction. I don't know what evidence he relies on for addiction. We do know that he gambled a lot. We do know that from his tax returns, he indicated that his winnings matched his losings for a number of years. We do know that in the later years before indictment, the amounts were I think \$25,000 a year to \$32,000 a year to \$50,000 a year, something of that kind, but in the matters that we relayed to the Court in our sentencing memorandum for what he actually did to expend the funds from the 10 victims in this case totaling more than \$1 million, there are, granted, Foxwoods items in there and so forth, but there are a number of others as well.

From the victims' funds, he, for example, paid his

taxes or some of his taxes totaling more than \$33,000, he took out cash totaling \$49,019. He took out payments that were made out to himself in the amount of \$105,910. He paid his own property expenses to the tune of more than \$53,000. As I said, he gave \$50,000 to a prior complainant that's beyond the statute of limitations, so these are some of the ways that he expended some of that money.

So the idea that gambling made me do this is not justified or warranted at all for what he actually did with the funds from these 10 victims totaling more than \$1 million.

His activity went on for such a long period of time, bothered so many, both destroyed the business lives at least of several of the victims as laid out in the pre-sentence report, all the while, he was lying to them from the very beginning, telling them that their funds would be in an escrow account when he immediately spent them.

Then when they said why are there delays, he gave them excuses everywhere from his mother was dying or had died or an uncle was dying, at one point somebody was racing in the Boston Marathon, and he had to go to support them, all kind of excuses for delays, then when they pressed and pressed and pressed, he sent them a request for refund form, literally preprinted form that he had, assuring them the moment I get that back, your funds will be refunded to you.

When they quarreled more with him and demanded their

02:13PM 10

2.

1.3

02:14PM 20

2.

02:16PM 20

02:15PM 10

refund more from him, he simply cut off communications entirely. He even went to the point of threatening some of them. For example, one of the complainants was the person that the probation department asked about how they lost their entire business as a result of the money deposited with the defendant.

And this was Cleaner Bright and in communications with him over and over and over, the owner of Cleaner Bright tried to get his money back, and the defendant simply stalled him for a long period of time and then ended up threatening him.

In one communication, he said, "Like I said, sign the refund form, which is already in the mail. I see one thing posted," meaning on the Internet or a complaint somewhere, "you will NEVER get paid, "never" in capital letters. I will sue you like you've never seen before. You already slandered me with a vendor," which was the person who connected the defendant to the small business owner, "who already got paid from us on a previous deal, so be careful what you do. We have policies and procedures to follow. Sorry you don't like them, but we have them for a reason, so sign the form, you get your money, that simple, you go the other route, that's your decision. Oh, I don't play games, I don't have the time for it, seems you do. Do yourself a favor, go make some money instead of wasting time on this nonsense, makes you no money at all. Please sign so I can process your refund. Thanks, Joe."

Now, this is the kind of thing that he kept doing to

2.

1.5

02:17PM 20

02:17PM 10

people. In other communications with the same individual, he threatened him, just as he did here with suing him. So he destroyed the business careers of a number of the 10 people. He did it maliciously and deliberately, he did it over and over, and he claims in his memorandum to you to be a small business employer and working hard on his own business.

The reason I stated in the sentencing memorandum, we grant that he ran a small business, but he used it to destroy others, and we suggest, your Honor, from the defense arguments, there's simply no basis for a downward departure. There's no basis for a lenient sentence for this defendant whose activity was so malicious and so prevalent, and he truly took advantage of people who had no choice.

I will finish by saying the one person, for example, that is so tangible to you that had no choice was the woman who had to take a \$125,000 loan just to try to keep her business operating because the defendant had taken her funds, stalled her for so long that she couldn't stay alive without some immediate input of cash.

She tried to do the best she could under that forced loan. She couldn't make the payments even after the lender was kind enough to her to say we will let you adjust your payments, and when she finally defaulted, that lender went back to the defendant's associate in Florida and said we want our commission of \$9,000 we paid to you, we want it back. She came

2.

1.5

02:19PM 20

02:18PM 10

to the defendant, said you have to repay me \$4500 because that's what I paid you out of it. He refused. He stalled her. Your Honor, this defendant richly deserves the sentence of 54 months. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. Mr. Chambers.

MR. CHAMBERS: Judge, if I may, Mr. Angelo stands before the Court. He's 60 years old. He did run a small business for many, many years, almost over 30 years. He's been married to the same woman. She's in the courtroom in support of him, his wife, Robin, for 37 years.

Your Honor, since the charges occurred and Mr. Angelo's has been on probation, his business was closed prior to that. There is no way he's ever going to be involved in that type of business again.

For the last two years while on probation, he's done nothing but work to support his wife and his family. He drives for Uber seven days a week, your Honor. It's a completely different business. He's not in the loan or mortgage business again.

I would submit, yes, he completely accepted responsibility, that's why we're here today. I have a duty as his attorney to make legal arguments, and one of the legal arguments I made at the inception of this case was that there was a fine line between civil liability and criminal liability,

2.

02:21PM 20

02:20PM 10

and I understand what my Brother is saying about how Mr. Angelo has hurt and affected the lives of many of these people that own businesses, and for that he's truly sorry, your Honor, and I would submit that at age 60, he has no reason to ever, ever be involved with people's money like that again or be involved in giving or getting loans for people, so his ability to re-offend I would submit is very low, your Honor.

Being on probation for two years, like I said, he's not even picked up a parking ticket. He's lost his home. He lost his business. We're not -- I'm not standing before you saying he has a gambling addiction problem, but I would submit, Judge, he did have a serious gambling problem at the time, as his tax returns and the monies, a lot of this money was used gambling, and I would submit, Judge, these were cases where people applied, and there was a contract at the beginning, and they were sophisticated business people, and in these contracts, it stated very clearly that their deposits would be at risk.

I understand the government's position, obviously, and my client pled guilty to wire fraud, and he's accepting responsibility for taking these people's money, but I believe in his mind, on each individual basis he actually meant to give the money back, and he thought he would win it back gambling, et cetera. He went down a bad path, and for that Judge, he's very sorry, but I would submit that this is a case that falls

outside of the heartland, and I did quote in my memorandum, I talked about *U.S. vs. Prosperi*, which was a First Circuit case, 2012, where that had to do with the Big Dig and the two owners of that company involved in a scheme defrauding the government of millions and millions of dollars, your Honor, but I think why I'm asking the Court to step back and look at this in a different way is because here Mr. Angelo prior to this had never been in trouble.

He never did anything wrong, Judge, and in this case, this wasn't something that he did in a violent way, and I know my Brother said he threatened these people, but I would say there's a distinction here between civil and criminal, and in these cases where he says, you know, I'll sue you, he's talking to business people.

In a lot of these cases, Mr. Angelo was sued civilly and he defended, in fact, one of them he won. The case was dismissed civilly, so some of these cases held up to where maybe he would have been liable in a civil setting, but, again, I'm making these arguments, but he's fully accepted responsibility.

I would submit that he did have a gambling problem. I would submit that based on his age and where he is in life and what he's gone through in facing these charges, your Honor, this is a person that should have no reason to ever, ever be before this Court again or ever involved in anything like

02:22PM 10

2.

1.3

02:22PM 20

this, and for all those reasons, I'm asking for leniency for my client, and I'm asking the Court to adopt my argument with respect to the fact that this case does fall outside of the heartland, and I would ask for a departure where right now what he's looking at for a sentence, Judge, I don't think that that would be in the interests of justice for a man that's never been in trouble before, your Honor. I know my client would like to also address the Court briefly.

THE COURT: All right. Before that, is there any response, Mr. Wild?

MR. WILD: Yes, briefly, your Honor. First of all, there was never a case the defendant ever, ever won. The one case that was dismissed was dismissed only because the victim company had been destroyed and went into bankruptcy, and the bankruptcy trustee, therefore, owned the company and the bankruptcy trustee dismissed the suit against the defendant because there were no assets for the trustee to recover from the defendant. That is the only reason one case was dismissed. The defendant lost other cases.

One final comment, if I may, your Honor, is that there was \$186,000 that was received by the defendant and his family as a result of his actions to hide assets during the time that he knew civil suits were pending and that the government was investigating. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Angelo, do you

02:23PM 10

2.

02:24PM 20

wish to address the Court before I impose sentence?

2.

1.3

1.5

02:25PM 20

02:25PM 10

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Your Honor, thank you for allowing this time. First I'd like to say I'm so sorry for the loss all these people had to go through. I tried so hard to gamble my way out of this problem, but I only got deeper and deeper.

I'm very humble and ashamed of my actions. Because of my actions, I lost everything as well. Your Honor, I'm 60 years old and work 7 days a week. All I think about every day is getting these people back their money and supporting my family. I sincerely hope you can find deep in your heart given this broken person before you who made a terrible mistake a second chance at life and so I can make the situation right. Thanks for listening.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. This is a cold-hearted crime, to be blunt about it. These are victims who are small business owners. There were at least 10 of them, maybe more. This was an elaborate course of conduct, a scheme that lasted for multiple years, involved multiple lives and falsehoods.

This was not a one-time moment of weakness. This was not a series of technical violations or something even close to the line, it was simply theft, and theft from vulnerable victims, perhaps not little old ladies on social security but close enough, small business owners who could ill-afford the

loss, not stealing from big institutions, stealing from the government or big banks or insurance companies, it's not like that's okay, but these victims here were vulnerable, unusually so, and the defendant knew that and preyed on them and lied to them over and over and over and over again, and a consequence has to flow from that, a serious consequence, not just simply a promise that it won't happen again but something much more significant than that.

It's true the defendant is 60 years old and that he has no criminal history to speak of. His family appears to love him. Of course, he lied to his family, has brought shame on them. He has put his wife in financial peril for no good reason. He says all of this is because of the gambling addiction.

The word "addiction" is thrown around a lot these days. There's no physical issue here. There's no chemical or physiological change. It's not like a drug addiction. I have no doubt that the behavior at some level was compulsive or that there was a problem, but I don't even have a psychiatrist or psychological report, and it's really not an excuse.

I mean, you have to live with the consequences of your actions, and the idea that you are making things worse because you thought you could gamble your way out of it does not move me particularly, so what to do with all of this?

The guideline sentence, the low end is 51 months in

02:27PM 10

2.

02:28PM 20

prison, which is more than four years. I'm struggling to see why that's not the appropriate sentence here, given the facts and circumstances. Again, it's cold. It's a cold crime. It's not a heat of passion crime, not a momentary crime, not a crime of youth.

I mean, he's 60 years old, but that kind of cuts both ways, doesn't it? 17-year olds do stupid things all the time, but by the time you're 50 or 60, you ought to know better and not to have the judgment and experience to live a law-abiding life.

What I'm going to do is this. My sense is that the guideline range is perhaps on the high end, and as an act of mercy and a little more than that, I'm going to impose a shorter sentence, but it is going to be a significant sentence of imprisonment because the defendant deserves and has earned it.

What I'm going to do is to impose a sentence of 40 months in prison, which is considerably below the guideline range. It's still a long sentence. It's nearly three and a half years. In good conscious, I can't go below that, and I'm going to struggle even to justify that departure downward from the guidelines, but that's the sentence I'm going to impose.

I'm not going to impose a fine because to the extent there's any money here at all, and I don't think there is, it ought to go to the victims, and I'm going to impose a

02:29PM 10

1.5

02:30PM 20

2.

1.5

02:32PM 20

02:32PM 10

three-year term of supervised release as well, and I will make the recommendation that the defendant serve his term of imprisonment either at Devens or as close as possible to Massachusetts.

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. With that, I'm going to formally state the sentence I'm going to impose followed by a formal statement of the reasons. When I've done that, I'll give counsel a final opportunity to make any additional objections or corrections or additions before I formally impose it.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and having considered the sentencing factors set forth at 18 United States Code, Section 3553(a), it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Joseph L. Angelo, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 40 months.

This term consists of terms of 40 months on Counts 1 to 11 to be served concurrently. The Court makes a judicial recommendation that the defendant shall be incarcerated at a facility commensurate with security as close as possible to Massachusetts, either at Devens, if that space is available, or if it is not available, appropriate elsewhere close to Massachusetts.

The Court makes a further jurisdictional

recommendation that the defendant receive gambling treatment while in Bureau of Prisons' custody. Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. This term consists of terms of three years on all counts to run concurrently. Within 72 hours of release from Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the district to which he is released.

The defendant is ordered to make restitution to the victims in the amounts indicated in the pre-sentence report, which will be set forth in detail in the judgment.

There are 10 identified victims with an amount totaling \$1,164,568.69. Any payment made that is not payment in full shall be divided proportionately among the parties named. Payment of restitution shall begin immediately and shall be made according to the requirements of the Federal Bureau of Prisons' inmate responsibility program while the defendant is incarcerated and according to the Court-ordered repayment schedule during the term of supervised release.

All restitution payments shall be made to the clerk,
U.S. District Court to transfer to the identified victims. The
defendant shall notify the United States Attorney for this
district within 30 days of any change in mailing or residence
address that occurs while any portion of the restitution
remains unpaid.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall

02:33PM 10

2.

1.3

02:34PM 20

comply with the following terms and conditions:

2.

1.5

02:35PM 20

02:35PM 10

He must not commit another federal, state or local crime and must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

I'm suspending drug testing conditions based on my determination that he poses a low risk of future substance abuse. He must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by probation. He must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court, which are set forth at 5D1.3C of the Sentencing Guidelines, and which will be set forth in detail in the judgment.

He is prohibited from frequenting or being present at establishments whose primary purpose or function is gambling. He's prohibited from participating in any gambling activities of any kind, whether casino gambling, online gambling, lotteries, instant scratch tickets, Keno, and any other activities similar in nature.

He must attend a gambling specific treatment program and/or meetings as directed by probation. He must pay the balance of any restitution imposed according to a Court-ordered repayment schedule. He's prohibited from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of probation while any financial obligations remain outstanding.

He must provide the probation office access to any requested financial information which may be shared with the

financial litigation unit of the U.S. Attorney's Office, and he shall be required to contribute to the costs of evaluation, treatment, programming and/or monitoring based upon the availability to pay or availability of third-party payment. He shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$1,100, which shall be due immediately, and the government's motion for entry of order of forfeiture is granted.

You may be seated. In terms of the formal reasons for the sentence, it is a nonguideline sentence imposed for the reasons indicated, primarily focusing on the defendant's age and lack of criminal history. I do think supervised release is appropriate under the circumstances, and I'm imposing no fine because to the extent that there are financial resources available, they should go to pay the large restitution obligation.

What is the government's view on self-surrendering, you do not oppose that, right?

MR. WILD: No objection to self-surrender.

THE COURT: It is further ordered that the defendant self-surrender at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons six weeks from today, June 11th.

Do counsel have any addition or correction or objection to that sentence not previously raised?

MR. WILD: None from the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Chambers.

1.5

02:36PM 10

18

19

1

2.

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

1.3

14

16

17

02:37PM 20

21

22

23

24

1 MR. CHAMBERS: No objection, I just ask that you 2 reserve my rights. 3 THE COURT: All right. The sentence is hereby imposed 4 as stated. 5 Mr. Angelo, let me give your advice of rights. You 6 can appeal your conviction if you believe that your quilty plea was unlawful or involuntary or if there was some other 7 fundamental defect in the proceeding that has not been waived. 8 9 You have a right to appeal your sentence under some 10 circumstances if you believe the sentence was contrary to law. 11 If you're unable to pay the costs of appeal, you may 12 ask permission to have those costs waived and appeal without 13 pain. You must file any notice of appeal within 14 days after 14 the entry of judgment, and if you request, the clerk will 1.5 immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf. 16 Is there anything further, Mr. Wild? 17 MR. WILD: No, your Honor, thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Chambers. 18 19 MR. CHAMBERS: No, Judge, thank you. 02:38PM 20 THE COURT: Thank you. We'll stand in recess. 21 THE CLERK: All rise. 22 (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.) 23 24 25